DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 790 FL 007 882

AUTHOR Politzer, Robert L.
TITLE On Hyphenated Linguistics and Hyphenated Americans. CATESOL Occasional Papers, No. 1.
INSTITUTION California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 8p.; For related documents, see FL 007 883-888

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Applied Linguistics; Communication (Thought Transfer); Cross Cultural Studies; Educational Philosophy; *English (Second Language); Language Attitudes; *Language Instruction; Language Variation; Learning Processes; Linguistic Theory; Mexican Americans; Negroes; Nonstandard Dialects; *Psycholinguistics; *Second Language Learning; Sociocultural Patterns; *Sociolinguistics; Student Motivation

ABSTRACT

The relevance of psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics to language instruction is discussed. English as a second language has traditionally been ignored by English departments, and second language teaching in general has received little attention in language departments because of the emphasis on literary studies. ESL and EFL have emerged under the aegis of linguists interested in language acquisition, and have traditionally been directed at foreign students, while neglecting segments of the American population that are proficient in other languages or are in need of instruction in English as a second dialect. Psycholinguistics has contributed to alter this situation by attempting to understand the learning process. Sociolinguistic studies have contributed by: (1) examining what elements of culture and what cultural patterns are necessary to facilitate the communication process between different cultural groups, (2) defining the study and the awareness of the language teaching process, and (3) studying motivation and language attitudes. (CLK)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED127790

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ON HYPHENATED LINGUISTICS AND HYPHENATED AMERICANS*

Robert L. Politzer
Stanford University

Most of the past 25 to 30 years of my life have been devoted to the study of problems of second language teaching and learning in situations in which the second language is a language other than English. During the past 25 to 30 years I have also been aware of the fact that in the USA the teaching of "foreign languages" has been heavily influenced by, and owes a large debt to, the developments taking place in the teaching of English as a second language. There are probably various reasons why English as a foreign language or second language (EFL and ESL) has been, and still is, a primary moving force in second language teaching. One of these reasons may be the simple fact that foreign language teaching is typically controlled by Foreign Language Departments. Foreign Language Departments devoted only--and until recently, at least--a small part of their concerns to second language teaching. Much of their effort is and will continue to be focused on literary studies. The traditional English department, on the other hand, had usually almost no concern for the teaching of English as a foreign or second language. Thus ESL and EFL could emerge much earlier than foreign language teaching as relatively independent specializations, usually under the aegis and tutelage of linguists who tended to have greater interests (though not necessarily always greater insights) in the processes of language acquisition than their literary colleagues. At any rate, the continuous debt which foreign language teaching in the USA owes to the efforts of scholars in EFL and ESL is quite obvious and I am happy to acknowledge it at the very outset of my comments.

My own most direct and personal contact with the EFL/ESL effort came via the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan where I visited in the summers of 1953 and 1955 and where my wife and I moved on a permanent basis in 1956. Neither my reminiscenses nor my personal life history are, of course, particularly relevant to my topic, but some reflections on foreign language teaching and ESL teaching of the mid-fifties and a comparison of the situation of 1974 are. In 1954 the English Language Institute had been in existence for over 10 years and the late Charles Fries' great methodological discoveries (e.g. conversion of structuralist linguistic discovery procedures into substitution and replacement type pattern drills and the utilization of contrastive analysis for the preparation of teaching materials) had been known and accepted as the foundations of EFL by his disciples and by others who were either directly or indirectly under the influence of Charles Fries or of other linguistic structuralists. The expansion of the structuralist methodologies into the teaching of foreign languages (French, Spanish, Ger-

FL007882

* Address delivered originally as the keynote speech for the Annual Convention of the California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, San Francisco, April 27, 1974.

man) was on its way. It was to gain full impetus and momentum only about four or five years later with the passage of the National Defense Education Act of 1958. Yet the groundwork for the events of 1958 was already being prepared by the Foreign Language Program of the Modern Language Association of America under the admirable leadership of the late Professor William R. Parker.

I need not dwell on the rather well-known fact that the field of linguistics, and with it the theories of language teaching, have changed since 1954. Of greater immediate interest is a comparison of the goals and contexts of EFL/ESL and foreign language teaching within the 1954 and 1974 time frames. The "revival" of EFL in the 1940's had been first tied to the war effort (training of foreign military personnel in English) and then to the teaching of English proficiency (especially comprehension and speaking skills) to foreign students who were coming to the USA in increasing numbers to study at American universities. The teachers of English as a foreign language who were being trained in the 1950's were supposed to become teachers of foreign students either at home or possibly abroad. American universities specializing in the training of EFL teachers established contact with, or assumed major responsibility for, EFL teacher training in other countries (such as Japan, the Phillipines). But English as a second language for Americans--right here in the United States?? "To the best of my recollection"--"within the time frame of 1954" it seemed to have been a non-problem and the concept that it was not a problem was probably reinforced by the Foreign Language Program of the Modern Language Association of America which was to argue successfully in 1958 that the national security of the United States was threatened by the fact that we were a nation of monolingual speakers of English. In retrospect one can only say that it was strange indeed how both the English as a foreign language effort and the foreign language teaching programs of the fifties tended to simply overlook large segments of the American population who were (1) proficient in languages other than English (2) in need of instruction in English as a second language.

Both the nature of linguistics and some of the interests and goals of second language teaching have changed since 1954. In the field of linguistics, there have been two major currents of change. The first deals with the replacements of structuralism by various formulations of transformational grammar, the second (sometimes related to and sometimes in obvious conflict with the first!) is represented by attempts to integrate the study of language with fields like psychology and sociology and to view language in the context of the real world in which it operates. Both currents have made, and will continue to make, important impacts in language teaching. Of the two currents the second is, in my opinion, the more important. At any rate, a great deal has been written and said about the possible connections of TG grammar and language teaching and the topic is not related to the issues to be raised in this presentation. The main reason why sociolinguistics or psycholinguistics, the "hyphenated linguistics" of the border areas between linguistics and other disciplines, seem better candidates for pedagogical importance than linguistic theory as represented by TG grammar is simply that language teaching and learning are psychological processes taking place in the real world, in real time, in a real social context. We can, therefore, hope that disciplines considering these real contexts and processes may furnish insights into language

teaching which will turn out to be at least as important as the theoretical descriptions of the underlying competence which is to be created in the learner. Emphasis of the importance of the psychological and sociological processes and frameworks of language acquisition, as opposed to the description of the code to be learned, can also be derived from some of the goals which language teaching, especially the teaching of English as a second language to minority groups or the controversial teaching of so-called "standard English" as a second dialect, has set for itself in recent years.

Of course nobody ever doubted that, let us say, the learning of French by an American student was a psychological process, that it should lead to some sort of understanding of French culture and, probably some sort of communicative competence within a French cultural framework. But in the context of teaching French in suburbia USA--or even in the context of teaching English as a foreign language to middle or upperclass foreign students--the acquisition of the code (or of a reasonable approximation of the code) is obviously the dominant task. The code and its description can easily dominate the concerns of the student as well as those of the teacher. In the teaching of English as a second language to Mexican-Americans or "standard" English to Afro-Americans, the importance of the code and its correct description is much less obvious. Most if not all Mexican-Americans do, of course, acquire a knowledge of English, whether they are ever taught English as a second language or not. And that Blacks do speak English and that all of them do in fact have at least receptive competence in so-called standard English is also fairly clear. Thus in the second language and second dialect teaching situations, the emphasis and concern shift away from the descriptions of the code and turn to psychological and sociological processes which take place during the language teaching situations and, perhaps even more importantly, to the psychological and sociological reasons which made them necessary.

Let us sketch briefly some of the more important psycholinguistic and sociolinguistic developments which hold out the promise of influencing second language teaching. During the sixties the field of psycholinguistics was dominated by two major currents of concern: (1) the establishment of the psychological reality of TG grammar (2) the study of the exact nature and developmental stages of first language acquisition. The first of these currents seems to have run its course; the second is still in full force and perhaps even gathering momentum. It is also the second current which holds a promise for leading to a better understanding of second language learning and as a result to improvement of second language teaching. Some of the methods used in the study of first language acquisition are now being utilized in the investigation of second language learning process. The question as to similarities and differences between first language and second language acquisition are being asked by such pioneering scholars as Professor Susan Erwin-Tripp at U.C., Berkeley; Evelyn Hatch at U. C., Los Angeles; and in some research projects currently carried out at Stanford. Bilingual Education programs or total immersion language programs in which second languages are acquired in natural contexts resembling those of first language learning rather than as the result of carefully structured language teaching curricula can prove particularly useful for the investigation of such questions as whether there are natural sequences of second language learning or whether

second language learning strategies resemble those which characterize first language acquisition. For too long language teaching research has emphasized the manipulation of teaching strategies designed to influence a little known and relatively little investigated process of language learning. The shift from inquiries about teaching to inquiries about learning and a better understanding of the learning process may very well enable us to make better decisions about how and what to teach, how to adapt sequencing of teaching materials to natural sequences followed in the learning process rather than to linguistic notions of simplicity or complexity of linguistic structure or teachers' preconceived ideas of what constitutes a progression from simple to more complex patterns.

Just as with psycholinguistic inquiry, the sociolinguistic research of the past decade can also be divided into two broad general currents (though there is in terms of personal interests of individual scholars as well as in subject matter a great deal of interplay and overlap between the two currents): (1) one general type of sociolinguistic research is heavily statistically oriented, addresses itself to the question of variability in language, and attempts to link linguistic phenomena, especially variation, to sociological variables. (2) The other type of sociolinguistic inquiry is less dominated by statistics and concentrates on a detailed description and analysis of the communicative process (perhaps the most typical sample of the first type of sociolinguistic research are the J. Fishman et al studies in Bilingualism in the Barrio, University of Indiana Press, 1971). Representative of the second type is the research of Dell Hymes and Joseph J. Gumperz, cf. J. J. Gumperz and D. Hymes etc., Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication, New York, Holt Rinehart and Winston, 1972. I am indebted to Professor J. Neustupný, "Sociolinguistics and the Language Teacher," Language Teaching Problems and Solutions, Bundoora, Victoria: La Trobe University, 1972, pp. 31-66, for the distinction between the main streams of modern sociolinguistics and for some suggestions concerning the usefulness of sociolinguistic inquiry for language teaching).

The first type of sociolinguistic research has furnished many valuable data concerning bilingual behavior or the nature of the varieties of Black English. However, it is on the second type of research and its rather promising relation to second language teaching that I would like to comment. Three areas of possible cooperation between sociolinguistics and language teaching, all of particular importance in the context of teaching English language skills to so-called minority groups like Mexican-American or Afro-American, are emerging.

(1) The Sociolinguistics of the ethnography of communication put into sharp focus just what elements of culture and what cultural patterns must be taught in order to facilitate the communication process between different cultural groups or subgroups. That the teaching of culture and of language must go hand in hand has, of course, always been acknowledged; e.g., obviously a Japanese student cannot really use the term "high-school" in a meaningful way if he does not understand just what an American high school is like and in what ways it may or may not resemble a Japanese secondary school. But the study of ethnography of communication can tell us much more precisely just at what points

communication may in fact break down and misunderstandings may occur. Communication involves more than mastery of a linguistic code. As sociolinguists have demonstrated, it also entails rules of code switching, a complex set of nonverbal rules of communication, rules of etiquette, rules of what can be referred to directly, what should be only alluded to, etc. As a matter of fact, the more the person who is outside a specific cultural group or subgroup approaches mastery of the purely linguistic code of the group, the less likely it becomes that his violations of the non-linguistic rules of communication will be understood and tolerated. Especially for a pluralistic society like ours in which at least a variety of English is spoken and understood by, if not all, at least the vast majority, breakdowns in communication between cultural subgroups may often not be caused by an absence of linguistic knowledge of English, but may rather be hidden and aggravated by the presence of such knowledge. At any rate, a teaching of linguistic codes isolated from the communication framework in which they operate may often miss the point if the goals of instruction are to improve understanding between different subgroups of the American scene.

(2) Since teaching itself is predominantly a process of linguistic communication, the sociolinguistics of communication can help us to refine and and define our study and awareness of the language teaching process itself. Most experienced teachers of English as a foreign language know that certain classroom procedures developed and employed in the USA (e.g. loud choral repetition, volunteering of responses, "searching" questions addressed by the student to the teacher) may be totally unacceptable--and alien to--many foreign cultures. Applying sociolinguistic analysis of the ethnography of communication to the teaching process will keep us from committing the error of expecting acceptance of such procedures from cultural groups that have communicative style diametrically opposed to this aspect of methodology.

(3) Sociolinguistics has made us aware of the fact that the learning and the use of a linguistic code are accompanied by a complex set of motivational and attitudinal factors which in turn have a major impact on the entire process of language acquisition as well as its results (see R. C. Gardner and W. E. Lambert, Motivation and Attitudes in Language Learning, Rowley, Mass: Newbury House Publishers, 1972). It is in this important area of the study of motivation and attitudes that an intersection of both psychology and sociology ("social psychology") finds common grounds with both linguistics and language teaching: e.g. in any situation in which we teach a second language or a second dialect (English to Mexican-Americans, standard Spanish to Mexican-Americans, standard English to speakers of "non-standard" Black English, etc.) the motivation of the learner is of overwhelming importance. Before we undertake the task of teaching the second language or dialect we should, indeed, ask ourselves the question whether the motivation for language acquisition exists or whether we have any reason or right to expect it to be present. The communicative speech act is accompanied by attitudinal reactions, and both the reactions of the listener as well as those of the speaker must be taken into consideration in the processes as well as in the goals of language teaching. To put it more bluntly, if we undertake to teach standard Spanish to Mexican-Americans or Afro-Americans is it really because we want to enable them to communicate more effectively--or do we go in for the enterprise because we, "they" (?),

or "someone else" has negative attitudinal reactions to a speech variety? I do not propose an answer to this question but I suggest that we keep asking it of ourselves as well as of others.

The above comment brings me to the conclusion of my presentation, which has dealt with hyphenated linguistics (though I realize that in writing psycho-or sociolinguistics are usually not hyphenated) and their particular relevance to the teaching of language skills to hyphenated Americans. I fully realize that many people object to the very concept of a hyphenated linguistics just as there are many who object to the concept of the hyphenated American. As a matter of fact, so do I. Of course the "hyphenated" concept has different connotations to different people. We can use the term psycholinguistics or sociolinguistics in order to express that human knowledge (which is really one and indivisible) is arbitrarily divided into fields like sociology, psychology, linguistics, etc., and that it is precisely at the areas of contact of intersection of these arbitrary divisions that new, exciting developments take place, new disciplines are born and new insights are being gained as the result of cross fertilization. Or we can use the terms psycholinguistics or sociolinguistics to imply that there is such a discipline or the "real linguistics" which is at the center of the "linguistic circle", which is concerned with the description of the linguistic code abstracted from a sociological or psychological context and that there are other disciplines which are perhaps of not quite the same value or prestige as the "real linguistics" and which are at the periphery or perhaps almost outside of the circle. It is the latter interpretation of the hyphenated linguistics concept that would be objectionable to me and to some others, if for no other reason that division of human knowledge into fields and/or concentric circles is, indeed, an arbitrary one. As a result it seems to be only the outcome of fortuitous circumstances whether one is (or at least perceives oneself to be) at the center rather than at the periphery of a field.

The analogy between the hyphenated linguistics and the hyphenated American has by now become quite obvious. If we speak about Afro-Americans or Mexican-Americans or Asian-Americans to imply that we live in a pluralistic society in which all of us have the right to retain a particular cultural heritage, if we keep in mind that in cultural contact just as in the contacts between scientific disciplines, new insights and new values may be born at precisely the points of contact between cultures, then the hyphenated-American concept becomes acceptable. If its use implies that there are "real Americans" who stand at the center of our society and others who are, if not outside, at least at periphery, then the concept of the hyphenated American must be rejected.

During the past years linguists and teachers of English have become aware of broader professional social responsibilities. The American Association of Teachers of English has formed a committee to deal with the phenomenon of "double speak" in politics and advertising and to devise teaching materials on unmasking its use and warning pupils of its possible dangers. A president of the Linguistic Society of America (Dwight Bolinger, in Language 40, 1973, 539-550) has recently reminded us that "truth is a linguistic question". As teachers of English as a second language move into such areas as bilingual

education for Mexican-Americans or standard English or speakers of non-standard dialect, our branch of the language teaching profession must also become aware of its wider social responsibilities and the other implications of its endeavors. We must also be concerned with changing attitudes toward varieties of language spoken by those who are perceived by some to be inside the center or the "main stream" of American life.

As teachers of standard English as a second language or dialect we can, of course, try to do something about the existence of language problems. But the persistence of language problems has seldom if ever purely linguistic causes. Thus we must address ourselves to the course of their persistence as well as those of their existence. The target of our efforts should not only be the speakers of non-standard dialects of English or Spanish. We must address ourselves to all those whose attitudes toward other cultural groups and language varieties puts them in the center of imaginary (but at the same time terribly real) ethnocentric circles that would relegate some members of our society to the periphery of American life.